

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON

JACOB PEOPLES,

Case No. 1:25-cv-00378-CL

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN
SERVICES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

KASUBHAI, United States District Judge:

This matter is before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Clarke issued a Findings and Recommendation on April 9, 2025, in which he recommends that this Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint with prejudice and deny the pending motions as moot. F&R, ECF No. 14. When a party objects to a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendations, the district court must “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the district court has no obligation to review the magistrate judge’s report. *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). However, the district court is not precluded from *sua sponte* review in such circumstances, *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985), and the Advisory Committee notes

to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) recommend that the court should review for “clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment.

Here, no party timely objected to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation. The Court has reviewed the record and finds no error.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Clarke’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF No. 14. Plaintiff’s Amend Complaint (ECF No. 13) is DISMISSED with prejudice and Plaintiff’s pending motions are DENIED as MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 6th day of May 2025.

s/ Mustafa T. Kasubhai
MUSTAFA T. KASUBHAI (He / Him)
United States District Judge